Numb. 236.

THE South-Carolina Gazette.

Containing the freshest Advices Foreign and Domestick.

THURSDAY, August 3, 1738.

Mr. *Timothy*,

THE unhappy Influence which controversy, too generally, has to divert Men's Minds from Attention to their Duty, had once determin'd my Silence in your Gazette debate concerning *Inoculation*: But observing, that others have since took Occasion from the Letter publish'd in your Gazette, (Numb. 232) and the *other* which came from the same Author, to make some Remarks on Things, which do not affect the Cause it self; and which I'm afraid will give a more unnecessary Diversion to your Readers; I have chang'd my Resolution, and send you the following Observations to be inserted in your next. I hope they will be acceptable to some of your Readers, and draw off their Attention, from what is more foreign, to the Matter in Question. I am,

Your humble Servant,

PHILO-VERUS PHILIRENUS.

I design no uncharitable *Reflections* upon the Gentlemen who have inoculated, or appear'd as Advocates for it. None can be more willing to make what favourable Allowances, the Case will admit of, for an Error in Practice founded on a Mistake of the Nature of the Action: But I hope it will not be construed to proceed from Want of Charity, or any other wrong Principle; to assert, and endeavour to prove in this publick Manner the *Immorality* of the Practice of *Inoculation*.

The Correspondent, in the above mentioned Gazette, begins with assuring the *Publick*; "that with God's Blessing the "Practice has hitherto had very happy Success, and fully answered as the best Means hitherto known or discovered for "abating the Rage, and avoiding the Danger of that fatal "Disease."—I wish he had not so soon ascrib'd the Success of this *Practice* to the *Blessing* of God: It's Consistency with *Morality* and *Religion* must *first* be solidly and convincingly prov'd, before it can Claim the *Benediction* of Heaven; we know who has said, that,——*they who tempt God are even delivered.* I am not to trouble the Reader with any Remarks on our Author's Calculation of the Numbers inoculated, and of the Deaths which have happened in either Way; however necessary such Proofs of Success be to his Argument for *Inoculation*, they are not to mine against it. Arguments in *Morality* and *Religion* should never be rais'd on so sandy a Foundation.

The *learned Author* strongly insinuates, that *other Objections* against the *Practice* are idle and trifling; and is pleas'd to assert, that the one he has considered, is *only* a little more popular and amusing.—I shall attempt to prove that some of those are not so *trifling* as our Author imagines; and that this is much more than *popular* and *amusing*.

The Truth which he lays for a Foundation I readily own; but cannot perceive what Relation it has, or Importance it is of, to the Cause he maintains. His own Limitation of *proper, moral* and *lawful*, when he speaks of Means, and which he carries through the Whole of his Letter, sufficiently shew, that he was aware of the Inconsistency of *some Means* with our Duty of *trusting to Providence*. Instead of his therefore I shall take leave to lay another Foundation; a Truth which I hope none will dispute,

That 'tis the *Prerogative* of God, and the Work of his Providence to preserve *whom he will* from the *actual Attack* of any Distemper.

This is a Part of our Idea of God as a *Governour of the World*; and an infallible Dictate of Reason it self: *Divine Revelation* makes it equally essential to him with his *Godhead*: 'Tis a Truth which must stand all possible Objections; nor can it depend on *variable* Circumstances attending Diseases, as particularly, whether the Distemper be *infectious* or not; whether *many* or *few* be preserved; whether the Danger of Death accompanying it be *greater* or *less*. These and the Like are Circumstances only, arising from the Manner in which God is pleas'd to exercise his Sovereign Right over his Creatures: But by no Means can any one singly, nor all of them taken together, ever become a Reason for our denying him the Honour of a Right which undoubtedly belongs to him as the *Lord of the Universe*.

It must be our Duty to acquiesce with a constant and sincere Veneration, *this* as well as the *other essential Claims* of the Deity; the Performance of all the *moral Ends* of Life being directly founded upon, and necessarily implying a dutiful Regard to the divine *Prerogatives* and the *Conduct* of his Providence in the Exercise of them. We do not, we cannot give God the Honour which is due to him, if we do not *trust* him with our Preservation from the very Distemper it self, in humble Resignation and Submission to his Will: The Reason of the Limitation, is that God preserves *some* not *all*. Our *Author*'s Idea of trusting to Providence must certainly exclude this; and consequently cannot be just.

Hence 'tis Evident to me, that Inoculation is a *most Immoral Practice*. Because, the use of any Means to bring a Distemper *prima Infantia*, or before Nature be in any real Distress, upon Ourselves; and to acknowledge that 'tis the Prerogative of God to preserve *whom he will* from that very Distemper, are utterly inconsistent. So great is the Self-Evidence of this Inconsistency that none can compare the two together in his own Mind, but the manifest and downright Contradiction of the one to the other, will immediately appear. Can that ever be made consistent with my Duty, which destroys the very Foundations of my Duty? Can the Intention of any *good End* at all, or the Apprehension of any Danger *whatsoever*, justify an undeniable *Encroachment* on God's more unquestionable and Sovereign *Right*; or make it no guilt to invade his Province as the Ruler of the World?

This one Principle will afford an easy Answer to all the *seeming* reasoning of our Author in the Rest of his Letter. His Argument in the Sixth Paragraph, is "If the "prudent Precautions of *Bleeding, Vomiting &c.* The "Use of some rational and experienced human Means, "for preventing the Danger and severity of this Distemper, be moral and consistent with our Duty of *trusting* "to Providence; then why not the *most prudent Precautions* "also of Inoculation? As it appears both from Reason "and

"and

" and Experience, the beſt and moſt effectual Means for " that Purpoſe, of all the prudent Precautions yet known " or diſcovered"? The Difference of the Means the *Author* compares is obvious and manifeſt; and ariſes from their different Natures and Ends. By the Uſe of the *former* preſent Health is preſerved; and the Body, by the Diſlodgement of noxious Principles cauſing Diſorder in the animal Oeconomy, prepar'd for receiving the Diſtemper, in what favourable Manner God ſhall be pleas'd himſelf to inflict it; by the latter we directly intend to bring on the Diſtemper; which is manifeſtly to uſurp God's Right of determining whether we ſhall have it or not, and at what particular Time. The Addition of " eſpecially as it is " the beſt hitherto known or diſcovered" makes me ſuſpect that the *Author* himſelf lays the *Streſs* of his Argument not on the Compariſon, or the Likeneſs of the Means, but upon the Succeſs: No Moraliſt or Divine can be allow'd to have Recourſe to Succeſs attending Men's Actions, when his Buſineſs is to prove the Morality of thoſe very Actions; becauſe no Succeſs can ever make an Action lawful, the Immorality of which can be made to appear from its own proper Nature Our *Author* beſides only aſſerts the Likeneſs of the Means; but does not advance any Proof to ſupport his Aſſertion: Till ſome ſufficient Argument be offered to remove the Diſparity ſo evident to me; I can't help thinking that his Way of Reaſoning is any Thing elſe than a fair begging the Queſtion. The Parentheſis near the End of this Paragraph " (and as ſuch it ought always to be conſidered previouſly to its being one in Conſcience") has no doubt ſurpris'd many of his Readers. Are any phyſical Reaſons at all; is even the moſt univerſal Experience ever to be urg'd in a direct Oppoſition to the *Prerogatives* of God, and the Laws of our Maker? Are not Reaſon and Scripture the Rules of our Conſciences, and not the Dictates of Phyſicians? It muſt firſt be made a Caſe of Conſcience, before it can be made one in Phyſick; except the *Author* will ſuppoſe that the Phyſician acts in the Buſineſs of his Profeſſion without any Conſcience, and that he may lawfully do ſo.

In his Seventh Paragraph we meet with ſome *parallel Caſes* which he intends we ſhould take as Arguments to ſatisfy us, that there is no *immorality* in *inflicting* a Diſtemper on Ourſelves. Not one of them all is parallel or alike to the Caſe of Inoculation; 'tis true *mortal* Diſtempers may be ſometimes the Conſequence of the Uſe of thoſe Means he mentions in the *firſt Claſs*, an Artery, for Inſtance may be prick'd in letting Blood, in Vomiting ſome Veſſel may poſſibly burſt, and prove fatal: But are theſe intended as the acute Diſtemper really is in the Caſe of Inoculation? A ſlight and tranſient Sickneſs may accompany the Application of thoſe Means, but is this inflicting an acute Diſtemper? or if our Author will have it to be ſo, is it inflicting a Diſtemper *prima inſtantia*, i. e before Nature labour under any real Diſorder. Will the *Author* allow this Way of arguing to be juſt in another *Caſe*: Becauſe we may lawfully prepare againſt the Attacks of an Enemy; we may as lawfully become Aggreſſors ourſelves, for fear others ſhould ſome Time after become our Enemies, and catch us at a Diſadvantage. As for *Salivation* and *Diſmembring*, they are ſtill leſs to the Purpoſe: Whoever ſalivated for Fear he ſhould afterwards catch the *venereal* or any other Diſtemper? Who in his right Wits would cut of a Finger, a Toe, an Arm or Leg of his Body for Fear he ſhould afterwards be ſeiz'd with a *Gangrene* or bit with a *Rattle ſnake*. The Author's Suſpicion of *a Circle in Reaſoning* is groundleſs; the Argument is, the Practice of Inoculation is immoral, becauſe inconſiſtent with our Duty of truſting to Providence; 'tis inconſiſtent with our Duty of truſting to Providence, becauſe it infers the Denyal of a Right in the ſupreme *Governour* of the World, to preſerve *whom he will*, from that very Diſtemper which Inoculation inflicts.

As for what our Author replies in Anſwer to the Objection, as he ſtates it himſelf in theſe Words, " but be- " cauſe it naturally tends to deſtroy Life;"—I muſt beg leave to uſe the Phraſe of *tempting* God, which was once mention'd by the Author himſelf when he propos'd the *Objection*, in the beginning of his Letter; but afterwards droy'd thro' the Courſe of his Reaſoning. To *tempt* God, ſo far as the preſent Queſtion is concerned in the Notion of it, is to put his Power and his Goodneſs to the *Tryal* by running the Riſque of Life, and the Hazard of Death, before his own Time, or before we are put by his Providence under any real and actual Neceſſity of ſuch a Riſque and Hazard.

This is the very Caſe of *Inoculation*; we voluntarily riſque our own Lives for Fear God himſelf the Lord of our Lives ſhould oblige us to run a greater Riſque afterwards: we doubt of his Power and miſtruſt his Goodneſs, both as to our actual Preſervation, and being carried with ſafety thro' the Diſtemper it ſelf, in the Way of natural Infection. We inflict it on ourſelves, when we pleaſe: Our Fear is the only Inducement to inoculate; the very Thing which God makes Uſe of as an Argument to engage our Truſt in his Providence: By all theſe Things, we limit the *Almighty*, and put his Power and his Goodneſs to the Tryal before his own Time, if this be not to tempt God, it will be hard to tell what it is Now the Author's Anſwer muſt fall of Courſe;——no Mediation of Art afterwards can juſtify my *tempting* him by precipitating my ſelf into the Danger of Death: The Preſumption there is in hoping for his Bleſſing upon that very Art whereby I tempt him, but adds to my Guilt in tempting him.

What is obſerved in the 9th Paragraph would be much to the Purpoſe, if true But, that it is not true is manifeſt from this, that it would, if true, deſtroy the particular Providence of God It cannot be concluded from the Idea of Infection implied in the Diſtemper, " that every one may preſume 'tis God's Time of inflicting the Diſtemper on his particular Perſon." How then, God would have no Prerogative at all to preſerve whom he pleaſed from the Diſtemper when it is infectious; and in the Caſe of contagious Diſeaſes the *divine Providence* would be no farther concerned than the Introduction of them into any particular Place or Community; not in their ſpreading or not ſpreading; nor in their affecting particular Perſons; nor in the Degree of Mortality in which they may rage. God forbid that theſe *particular Circumſtances* ſhould not be under the Inſpection of an infinitely wiſe, powerful and good Being. Can we poſſibly think, that becauſe a Diſtemper is *infectious*, and *once introduced*, particular Perſons are left in their own Hands, and to ſhift for themſelves the beſt Way they can.

The *Perhapſes* which I think had been better *let alone*, in an Argument where the *Prerogatives* of God & *his Providence* are ſo *deeply* concerned, may be eaſily reduced, for according to our *Author*'s own Calculation One in Five die in the *natural* Way; every one therefore has Five, for eſcaping with Life, ſuppoſing him actually ſeiz'd with the Diſtemper, againſt one, for dying. Nor does Providence deal more unfavourably with us in *this* than moſt other *malignant* and epidemick Diſtempers. Liberty muſt not be taken of multiplying *Chances* againſt truſting to Providence from what we ſee to be the Event, after Inoculation is once begun; this ſpreading the Diſtemper ſo quickly and rendering it ſeverer and more mortal in Subjects not *inoculated*—— The Terror of this Diſtemper, and the Fear of Death which attends it thro' the Courſe of Life, if one ſhould eſcape it, are good Things, and ought to be improv'd for good Ends in Religion.——Tho' one might poſſibly be Proof againſt the Infection in the *common* Way; is God to ſuſpend the Laws of Nature to preſerve ſuch a Perſon from the Diſtemper, if he be inoculated? Or ſuppoſing he ſhou'd, does not every ſuch Perſon *tempt* God, when he knows there is a natural Connexion betwixt the Infuſion of variolous Venom into the Wound, and the Diſeaſe which is the Effect of it; and really intends the Diſeaſe? May not ſome be Proof againſt the Infection, at one Time under the Protection of Providence, and not at another? And muſt not our Author allow, that infinite Wiſdom purſues wiſe Ends, by this Difference and Variety, tho' we ſhould not be able particularly to diſcover them.

The *Scriptures* are mentioned *once* by our Author;—— how much to his Purpoſe, let the Reader judge.—But do theſe Promiſes exclude all human Means? Or not rather include and imply them? Or is not our Dependance on thoſe Promiſes conſiſtent with the Uſe of theſe? Theſe are his Queſtions.——But do not Promiſes of actual Preſervation from the Attack of a Diſtemper, exclude all human Means of inflicting that Diſtemper; tho' they don't Means of Prevention? Theſe they may include and imply; but can they include thoſe without a Contradiction

Theſe

These are mine; let the impartial Reader compare and judge —The righteous Man will plead no Title, nor lay any Claim, either to *ordinary* or *extraordinary* Promises, exclusive of all Means: But every righteous Man ought to beware of such Means as destroy the very Nature of the Promises, on which he depends as a *Christian*. The *modest* and *humble* Christian will have more Confidence in God, and lets in other Things; be resign'd to the Will of God, in every Event, and leave his own Work to himself: But others, who dare not think of Death, and will not prepare may use any Means to avoid it, lawful or not; and become even Enthusiasts for Inoculation

---

(*Continuation of the Proceedings in Parliament*)

A Petition of the Trustees for settling the Colony of Georgia, was read in the House, setting forth the great Expences they have been at, in fortifying against the Attempts and Threats of the Spaniards against that Colony, &c Praying for such Assistance as the House shall think fit.

Ordered, That the said Petition be referred to the Consideration of the Committee of the whole House, to whom is referred the Consideration of the Supply to be granted to his Majesty.

A Petition of Edmund Saunders, Henry Tongue and Richard Farr, of the City of Bristol, Merchants, in Behalf of themselves, the Insurers, the Master and Mariners of the Ship Robert Galley of Bristol, Burthen 120 Tons, was presented to the House, and read, setting forth, that on the 30th of May, 1729, their said Ship proceeding on her Voyage from Guinea to Jamaica, was taken on the Coast of Hispaniola, 6 Leagues out at Sea, by a Spanish Guarda la Costa, and contrary to the Law of Nations and Treaties then subsisting, and the Ship and Cargo carried into St. Domingo, and there condemned; the Value of which, when taken, as attested on Oath by the Master, was 10664 *l.* Ster. and upwards, besides the Interest thereof for near 9 Years; and Admiral Stewart, when he was Commander in Chief of His Majesty's Ships of War then at Jamaica, sent His Majesty's Ship Tryal to St. Domingo, to demand Restitution; and that the Commander received for Answer, That the Ship and Cargo had been condemned by the Audience, and that there could be no Redress unless obtain'd in Old Spain. And that the Petitioners having made Application to His Majesty by Petition in Nov. and Begging His Majesty's most gracious Interposition, that Justice and Restitution might be done them; but receiving no Satisfaction, and the Spaniards continuing their Depredations, the Petitioners joined in a Petition with other Merchants of Bristol, to this House, in 1730, and then proved the Allegations thereof, when this House thought fit to address his Majesty, *That he would be graciously pleased to continue his Endeavours to prevent the Depredations of the Spaniards for the future, and to procure full Satisfaction for the Damages sustain'd*; whereupon Commissioners were appointed, by Virtue of the Treaty of Seville; and that the Petitioners having made Application to them, as well as to Mr. Keene His Majesty's Minister at the Court of Madrid, by a Memorial setting forth, and authenticated Papers annexed thereto, proving the Unjustness of the Capture of the said Ship, and the Loss sustained; which was delivered to his Grace the Duke of Newcastle, about the Month of July 1731; but that, no Relief being had thereupon, the Petitioners again petitioned His Majesty in the Month of September last; which was also delivered to his said Grace, and has been since transmitted to Mr. Keene; but no Answer being returned thereto, there is no Probability or Expectation of receiving any Satisfaction; and therefore praying the House, as the Measures hitherto pursued have proved ineffectual, to take the Premisses into further Consideration, and grant such Relief, as to the House shall seem meet, and that the Petitioners may be heard by themselves and Counsel thereupon.

The Petition of Samuel Bonham, Christoper Astley and others, Owners of the Ship Anne Galley, Burthen 130 Tons, was presented to the House, setting forth, that the Petitioners on the 14th of December, 1728, and since have delivered to his Grace the Duke of Newcastle, 17 Memorials and Petitions, addressed to his Majesty, and 4 others delivered at the Council Board, each Memorial and Petition setting forth the great Loss and Damage the Petitioners have met with by the unjust Capture of the said Ship and Cargo, taken by the Spaniards the 13th of June, 1728, valued at 10,500 *l.* Sterling, besides the Loss of the Interest for upwards of 9 Years. Which Petitions humbly besought His Majesty's Favour, Interest and Protection in recovering their Loss and Damage; and Satisfaction not being made, on the 24th of March 1736,7, they brought their Petition into the House, which was read. But the Petitioners have not received further Satisfaction, nor like to do therefore they pray the House to take their unhappy Case into Consideration, &c. It was *Ordered*, That the said 2 Petitions be referred to the Consideration of the Committee of the whole House, &c.

Ordered, That an humble Address be made to his Majesty, that he will be graciously pleased to give Direction, that there be laid before this House Copies of all Representations, memorials or Petitions made to his Majesty, relating to any Losses sustained by His Majesty's Subjects, by Depredations committed by the Spaniards in Europe or America.

March 13. Mr. Comptroler reported to the House, That pursuant to their Address, His Majesty would be graciously pleased to give Directions that there may be laid before this House Copies of the Representations, Memorials and Petitions that have been made to his Majesty relating to the Depredations made by the Spaniards. And on the 15th sundry of said Copies, by His Majesty's Command, were laid before the House, being in Number 71, 64 of which were made by the Merchants in the Year 1736. As also sundry Extracts, setting forth the State and Condition of 28 particular Vessels which have been taken and plunder'd by the Spaniards, with Proofs thereof.

[*To be continued.*]

Custom House, Charlestown,

Entred Inwards,

Ship Princess Carolina, Wm. Johnson from Affrica.
Snow Mary, John Coe from ditto.
Sloop Two Brothers, Peter Cannon from N York.
—— Warwick John Darrell } from Barbados.
—— George, Josi Dickenson }

Entred out,

Sloop Nottingham, John Rice for Providence.

Clear'd for Departure.

Brigt. Prosperous Sally, Peter Blake to N-Carolina.
Sloop Success, Josi Prew
—— Nottingham, John Rice } to Providence.
—— Elizabeth, Wm. Evans }

EXPORTED from this PLACE since Nov. 1, 1737.

Rice 34067 Barrels. Pitch 16588. Tarr 5322. Turpentine 818. Whereof 3982 Barrels of Rice to the Southward of *Cape Finisterre*.

Choice BARBADOS RUM, and the finest Clay'd and Muscovado Sugar, to be sold by *Gabriel Manigault.*

WHEREAS the Number of Poor and Sick daily encreases, and the Charge (as well as Difficulty) of providing Lodgings, Nurses, *&c* is very extraordinary. This is to give Notice, that the Church-Wardens have hired an House and provided proper Attendance for the Reception of all such as are real Objects of Charity, who are desired to apply in Time to the Subscribers.

James Crokatt } Church-Wardens.
Thomas Cooper }

Whereas the spreading of the Small-Pox, has rendered many incapable of paying their Tax, by the Time the Law prescribes This is to give notice that the Collectors will continue to set at the New-Market until the 10th Instant, after which time Executions will be issued against all Defaulters.

To be Sold the Plantation belonging to *James Watson* on *Back River*, containing about 800 Acres of Land, 150 of which is good Rice Land, the Remainder well stored with Fire wood, and good Pine Timber fitting for sawing, the Whole not exceeding half a Mile from a navigable River and Creek, upon which are several Landings, having a good Brick-house 36 Feet in length, 26 in Breadth, Cellars and Kitchin under the House, with a Well of good Water, a Barn and Outhouses, distant from *Charlestown* about 22 Miles by Land or Water, and 4 from *Goose Creek* Church.